



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,724	01/14/2000	Sharon S. Liu	5437-112	8756

29989 7590 10/30/2003

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
1600 WILLOW STREET  
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

AKPATI, ODAICHE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/483,724

Applicant(s)

LIU ET AL.

Examiner

Odaiche T Akpati

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-16, 22-37 and 43-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Elgamal (6389534 B1).

With respect to Claim 1, the limitation “receiving a request from the application for a customized implementation of a service” is met on column 4, lines 15-23.

The limitation “determining a set of zero or more restrictions to be imposed upon said customized implementation” is met on column 3, lines 50-58.

The limitation “dynamically constructing said customized implementation, said customized implementation incorporating said restrictions, and comprising enforcement logic for enforcing said restrictions; and providing said customized implementation to the application” is met on column 3, lines 40-45.

With respect to Claim 2, the limitation “wherein said customized implementation is invocable by the application without further interaction with the framework” is met on column 4, lines 3-9.

With respect to Claim 3, the limitation “wherein the system further comprises a general implementation for said service, wherein said general implementation is unrestricted, and wherein said customized implementation further incorporates said general implementation” is met on column 5, lines 39-42.

With respect to Claim 4, the limitation “wherein said enforcement logic enforces said restrictions on said general implementation” is met on column 5, lines 29-39.

With respect to Claim 5, the limitation “wherein said enforcement logic is invoked upon initialization of said customized implementation” is met on column 5, lines 3-8 and column 4, lines 15-23.

With respect to Claim 6, the limitation “wherein said enforcement logic, when invoked receives a set of desired parameters from the application determines whether the desired parameters exceed said restrictions; and in response to a determination that the desired parameters exceed said restrictions, preventing said customized implementation from operating” is met on column 5, lines 29-39.

With respect to Claim 7, the limitation “wherein said service is an encryption/decryption service, and wherein said enforcement logic, when invoked determines whether a particular exemption mechanism has been invoked; and in response to a determination that the particular

Art Unit: 2131

exemption mechanism has not been invoked, preventing said customized implementation from operating” is met on column 6, lines 19-29.

With respect to Claim 8, the limitation “wherein determining the set of zero or more restrictions comprises accessing information specifying one or more limitations; and processing said limitations to derive said restrictions” is met on column 6, lines 23-31.

With respect to Claim 9, the limitation “wherein said service is an encryption/decryption service, and wherein said information comprises a set of one or more default encryption limitations” is met on column 6, lines 16-22.

With respect to Claim 10, the limitation “wherein said default encryption limitations are derived by merging multiple jurisdiction policies and extracting therefrom the most restrictive encryption limitation” is met on column 3, lines 55-58.

With respect to Claim 11, the limitation “wherein determining the set of zero or more restrictions comprises accessing information specifying one or more limitations determining permissions, if any, granted to the application; and reconciling said limitations and said permissions to derive said restrictions” is met on column 6, lines 16-29.

With respect to Claim 12, the limitation “wherein said limitations and said permissions are reconciled to derive restrictions which are least restrictive” is met on column 6, lines 16-29 and column 9, lines 51-56.

With respect to Claim 13, the limitation “wherein said service is an encryption/decryption service, and wherein said information comprises a set of one or more default encryption limitations, and a set of zero or more exempt encryption limitations which apply when one or more exemption mechanisms are implemented” is met on column 6, lines 23-31.

With respect to Claim 14, the limitation “wherein said default encryption limitations and said exempt encryption limitations are derived by merging multiple jurisdiction policies and extracting therefrom the most restrictive encryption limitations” is met on column 3, lines 55-58.

With respect to Claim 15, the limitation “wherein reconciling said limitations and said permissions comprises determining whether the application has been granted any permissions; and in response to a determination that the application has not been granted any permissions, deriving said restrictions from said set of default encryption limitations” is met on column 9, lines 46-51.

With respect to Claim 16, the limitation “wherein reconciling said limitations and said

permissions comprises determining whether the application has been granted any permissions which require implementation of a particular exemption mechanism; in response to a determination that the application has been granted a permission which requires implementation of a particular exemption mechanism determining whether said exempt encryption limitations allow said particular exemption mechanism to be implemented; and in response to a determination that said exempt encryption limitations allow said particular exemption mechanism to be implemented, deriving said restrictions from said set of exempt encryption limitations” is met on column 7, lines 6-15.

With respect to Claims 22 and 43, its limitation is similar to Claim 1 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 23 and 44, its limitation is similar to Claim 2 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 24 and 45, its limitation is similar to Claim 3 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 25 and 46, its limitation is similar to Claim 4 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 26 and 47, its limitation is similar to Claim 5 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 27 and 48, its limitation is similar to Claim 6 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 28 and 49, its limitation is similar to Claim 7 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 29 and 50, its limitation is similar to Claim 8 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 30 and 51, its limitation is similar to Claim 9 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 31 and 52, its limitation is similar to Claim 10 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 32 and 53, its limitation is similar to Claim 11 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 33 and 54, its limitation is similar to Claim 12 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 34 and 55, its limitation is similar to Claim 13 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 35 and 56, its limitation is similar to Claim 14 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 36 and 57, its limitation is similar to Claim 15 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 37 and 58, its limitation is similar to Claim 16 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.



*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17-21, 38-42 and 59-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elgamal (6389534 B1) in view of Schell et al (5933503).

With respect to Claim 17, Elgamal meets all the limitation except that of a wrapper object being implemented and a dynamic implementation being utilized.

The limitation “wherein the system further comprises a general implementation for said service, and wherein dynamically constructing said customized implementation comprises” is met by Schell on column 6, lines 36-39.

The limitation “instantiating the general implementation to give rise to a general implementation instance instantiating a wrapper object; and encapsulating said general implementation instance and said restrictions within said wrapper object to derive said customized implementation” is met by Schell on column 8, lines 6-10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Schell within the system of Elgamal so as to make the system tamper proof.

With respect to Claim 18, Elgamal meets all the limitation except that of a wrapper object being implemented.

The limitation “wherein said wrapper object comprises one or more invocable methods, wherein said general implementation instance comprises one or more invocable methods, and wherein encapsulating comprises mapping one or more of the invocable methods of said wrapper object to one or more of the invocable methods of said general implementation instance” is met by Schell on column 9, lines 32-35 and 46-55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Schell within the system of Elgamal so as to make the system tamper proof.

With respect to Claim 19, Elgamal meets all the limitation except that of the wrapper object being implemented.

The limitation “wherein said wrapper object comprises initialization logic for enforcing said restrictions on said general implementation instance” is met by Schell on column 9, lines 42-45.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Schell within the system of Elgamal so as to make the system tamper proof.

With respect to Claim 20, Elgamal meets all the limitation except that of an initialization logic being invoked.

The limitation “wherein said initialization logic is invoked prior to allowing any of the invocable methods of said general implementation instance to be invoked” is met by Schell on column 9, lines 36-41.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Schell within the system of Elgamal so as to initialize the system.

With respect to Claim 21, Elgamal meets all the limitation except the limitation described in Claim 21.

The limitation “instantiating an exemption mechanism to give rise to an exemption mechanism instance and encapsulating said exemption mechanism instance within said wrapper object” is met by Schell on column 8, lines 6-20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Schell within the system of Elgamal so as to prevent an external attacker from gaining knowledge of what is contained within the system.

With respect to Claims 38 and 59, its limitation is similar to Claim 17 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 39 and 60, its limitation is similar to Claim 18 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claims 40 and 61, its limitation is similar to Claim 19 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claim 41 and 62, its limitation is similar to Claim 20 limitation and hence its rejection can be found above.

With respect to Claim 42 and 63, its limitation is similar to Claim 21 rejection and hence its rejection can be found above.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Odaiche Tracey Akpati whose telephone number is 703-305-7820. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-6.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7240 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

\*\*\*

October 20, 2003

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Application/Control Number: 09/483,724  
Art Unit: 2131

Page 12